arXiv:1409.4909v2 [math.NT] 23 Jul 2015

RECONSTRUCTING DECOMPOSITION SUBGROUPS IN ARITHMETIC FUNDAMENTAL GROUPS USING REGULATORS

A. IVANOV

Abstract. Our main goal in the present article is to explain how one can reconstruct the decomposition subgroups and norms of points on an arithmetic curve inside its fundamental group if the following data are given: the fundamental group, a part of the cyclotomic character and the family of the regulators of the fields corresponding to the generic points of all étale covers of the given curve. The approach is inspired by that of Tamagawa for curves over finite fields but uses Tsfasman-Vlăduţ theorem instead of Lefschetz trace formula. To the authors' knowledge, this is a new technique in the anabelian geometry of arithmetic curves. It is conditional and depends on still unknown properties of arithmetic fundamental groups. We also give a new approach via Iwasawa theory to the local correspondence at the boundary.

MSC classification: 14G32 (primary), 11R42, 11R29 (secondary)

1. Introduction

Let K be a number field, S a finite set of primes of K containing all archimedean primes and K_S/K the maximal extension of K unramified outside S. Let $\mathcal{O}_{K,S}$ be the ring of S-integers of K. Then the étale fundamental group of $\operatorname{Spec}\mathcal{O}_{K,S}$ is equal to the Galois group $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ of K_S/K. We discuss in this article, how one can deduce anabelian information on $\operatorname{Spec}\mathcal{O}_{K,S}$ from $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ and (essentially) the family of residues at $s=0$ of zeta functions of all intermediate fields $K_S/L/K$. Our goal, is to establish a *local correspondence on the curve* $\operatorname{Spec}\mathcal{O}_{K,S}$: i.e., given pairs (K_i,S_i) for $i=1,2$ and an isomorphism $\sigma\colon \mathrm{G}_{K_1,S_1}\xrightarrow{\sim}\mathrm{G}_{K_2,S_2}$, preserving the product 'class number times regulator' for all finite subextensions, let for any finite subextension $K_{1,S_1}/L_1/K_1$, denote the corresponding extension of K_2 via σ by L_2. For a scheme X, let $|X|$ denote the set of closed points of X. Under (unknown) additional requirements on G_{K_i,S_i}, we will show the existence of a compatible family of bijections

$$\sigma_{*,L_1}\colon |\operatorname{Spec}\mathcal{O}_{L_1,S_1}|\xrightarrow{\sim}|\operatorname{Spec}\mathcal{O}_{L_2,S_2}|$$

on closed points, for any finite subextension $K_{1,S_1}/L_1/K_1$, characterized by $\sigma(D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}})=D_{\sigma_*(\bar{\mathfrak{p}})}$, where $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is the decomposition subgroup of the point $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ and σ_* is the inverse limit of the maps σ_{*,L_1}. Moreover, the maps σ_{*,L_1} preserve absolute norms of primes.

Let us use the following notation: if (x),(y) are some sets of invariants of K,S (like, for example, the position of the decomposition groups of primes inside $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$), then (x) $\rightsquigarrow$ (y) resp. (x) $\leftrightsquigarrow$ (y) will have the following meaning: if the data in (x) are known, then we can deduce the data in (y) from them resp. the knowledge of (x) and (y) is equivalent. In particular, (x) $\rightsquigarrow$ (y) implies that if two pairs $(K_i,S_i), i=1,2$ are given with $\mathrm{G}_{K_1,S_1}\cong\mathrm{G}_{K_2,S_2}$ and such that the data in (x) coincide for $i=1,2$, then also the data in (y) are coincide.

The goal of the first part of the article is to establish σ_* on the primes lying *on the boundary*, i.e., in S. Here we enforce the main result from [Iv14], using methods from Iwasawa theory and the Greenberg conjecture ([Gre02] Conjecture 3.5). Here is our result in this direction. Let $S_\infty=S_\infty(K)$ resp. $S_p=S_p(K)$ denote the set of archimedean primes of K resp. the set of primes of K lying over p, and set $S^f:=S\smallsetminus S_\infty$.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume the Greenberg conjecture holds for all involved number fields and for the fixed prime p. Let K be a number field, $S\supseteq S_p\cup S_\infty$. Then*

$$(G_{K,S},p)\rightsquigarrow(D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}\hookrightarrow G_{K,S})_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}\in S^f\smallsetminus S_p}.$$

Key words and phrases. arithmetic curves, anabelian geometry, Dedekind zeta function, Brauer-Siegel theorem, Tsfasman-Vladut theorem, Iwasawa theory.

By all involved number fields we mean all finite subextensions of K_S/K. Let $\mathbb{N}(S) := \mathbb{N} \cap \mathcal{O}_{K,S}^*$. From Theorem 1.1 and [Iv14] Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 4.1 we immediately deduce:

Corollary 1.2. *Let* $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{K,S}$ *be such that at least two rational primes lie in* $\mathbb{N}(S)$ *and* $S_\infty \subseteq S$. *Let* $p \in \mathbb{N}(S)$ *and let* χ_p *be the* p*-part of the cyclotomic character on* $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$.

(i) *If the Leopoldt conjecture holds for all involved number fields and all primes and the Greenberg conjecture holds for all involved number fields for at least two primes in* $\mathbb{N}(S)$*:*

$$G_{K,S} \rightsquigarrow (D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} \hookrightarrow G_{K,S})_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in S^f}.$$

(ii) *If the Leopoldt conjecture holds for all involved number fields and all primes, then* $G_{K,S} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{N}(S)$ *and*

$$(G_{K,S}, \chi_p) \rightsquigarrow (D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} \hookrightarrow G_{K,S})_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in S^f}.$$

(iii) $(\mathrm{G}_{K,S}, p, \chi_p) \rightsquigarrow (D_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S})_{\mathfrak{p} \in S^f}$.

In the rest of the article we consider the local correspondence *on the curve*, i.e., for points $\notin S$. More precisely, we will give a (unfortunately, not purely) group theoretic criterion for a subgroup $D \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ to be a decomposition subgroup of a prime in the spirit of Tamagawa's work [Ta97] in the case of curves over finite fields. Here is our main result. The important technical conditions (C2)-(C4) made there will be explained in Sections 4.1, 5 below. Essentially, they ensure that $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ is sufficiently big and that the decomposition subgroups lie sufficiently independent inside it. Unfortunately, these conditions are still not known to hold for arithmetic fundamental groups.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that the generalized Riemann hypothesis holds for all involved number fields. For* $i = 1, 2$ *let* $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{K_i,S_i}$ *be an arithmetic curve. Let*

$$\sigma\colon \mathrm{G}_{K_1,S_1} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{G}_{K_2,S_2}$$

be a topological isomorphism of the fundamental groups. Assume that

(1) S_i *contains the archimedean primes and at least two rational primes are invertible on* $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{K_i,S_i}$, K_{i,S_i} *realizes locally at each* $\mathfrak{p} \in S_i$ *the maximal local extension*[1] *and* σ *induces a local correspondence on the boundary (cf. Corollary 1.2)*

(2) *condition (C4) and either condition (C2) or condition (C3) hold for* K_i, S_i *for* $i = 1, 2$[2]

(3) *for any finite (sufficiently big) subextension* $K_{1,S_1}/L_1/K_1$*, one has* $h_{L_1} \operatorname{Reg}_{L_1} = h_{L_2} \operatorname{Reg}_{L_2}$[3].

Then for any $K_{1,S_1}/L_1/K_1$ *finite,* σ *induces a bijection (the local correspondence map):*

$$\sigma_{*,L_1} : |\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{L_1,S_1}| \xrightarrow{\sim} |\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{L_2,S_2}|,$$

characterized by $\sigma(D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}) = D_{\sigma_*(\bar{\mathfrak{p}})}$*, where* σ_* *is the inverse limit over all* σ_{*,L_1}*. The maps* σ_{*,L_1} *are compatible for varying* L_1 *and preserve the residue characteristic and the absolute inertia degrees of primes.*

This theorem gives an approach to the (weaker form of) Isom-conjecture of Grothendieck (cf. [Gro83] and [NSW08] 12.3.4,12.3.5) in the case of arithmetic curves. Indeed, as σ_* preserves the absolute norm of primes, it also preserves the residue characteristics and the inertia degrees over $\mathbb{Q}$. Thus by Chebotarev density theorem, one has the following corollary (which is proven exactly as Theorem 2 in [Ne69]).

Corollary 1.4. *For* $i = 1, 2$ *let* $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{K_i,S_i}$ *be an arithmetic curve. If a local correspondence* σ_* *as in Theorem 1.3 is established, and* $K_1/\mathbb{Q}$ *is normal, then* $K_1 \cong K_2$.

As $h_L \operatorname{Reg}_L$ is encoded in the residue at $s = 1$ of the zeta-function ζ_L of L, Theorem 1.3 says essentially that $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ (under certain hypotheses, ensuring that it is sufficiently big) plus the family of the residues of the functions ζ_L for $K_S^\bullet/L/K$ at $s = 1$ give enough information to reconstruct K, at least when K is normal over $\mathbb{Q}$.

[1] If $S \supseteq S_p \cup S_\ell \cup S_\infty$ and S is defined over a totally real subfield, then this holds (cf. [CC09] Remark 5.3(i)).

[2] cf. Sections 4.1, 5.

[3] In fact, it is enough to require a condition on the behavior of this quantity in infinite Galois subtowers $K_{i,S_i}/\mathscr{L}_i/L_i/K_i$. Further, due to [Iv14] Proposition 4.2, it is equivalent to require equality of regulators.

The main idea in the proof of Theorem 1.3 is a group-theoretic characterization of decomposition subgroups of points on $\operatorname{Spec}\mathcal{O}_{K,S}$ in the spirit of Tamagawa's work [Ta97]. Instead of using étale cohomology and Lefschetz fixed point formula, which are not available in our case, we use the theorem of Tsfasman-Vlăduţ [TV02] (and its further generalization by Zykin [Zy05]), which is a generalization of the Brauer-Siegel theorem. The application of Tsfasman-Vlăduţ theorem is the place where we need the behavior of the regulators of the fields in question. While it is completely unclear how to recover these regulators from the fundamental group $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$, the p-adic volume $\mathrm{vol}_p(K)$ of the unit lattice (for totally real fields, it is the p-adic norm of the p-adic regulator) can be recovered if $S_p \subseteq S$ (see Section 6). Unfortunately, the p-adic analogue of Brauer-Siegel and hence also of Tsfasman-Vlăduţ fails (cf. [Wa82]), so our method would fail, if we replace Reg_K by $\mathrm{vol}_p(K)$. This do not exclude that there is still some similar way of using $\mathrm{vol}_p(K)$ to obtain information on decomposition subgroups.

Note the following subtlety: in the application of Tsfasman-Vlăduţ, we need to restrict attention to the maximal tame subextension, as infinitely wildly ramified towers are in general asymptotically bad and hence the invariants we work with get trivial. We were inspired to consider tamely ramified towers to obtain non-trivial invariants by the work of Hajir and Maire [HM01]. Nevertheless, part (2) of the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 concerns the *whole* group $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$, and not only its maximal tame quotient. This is possible because we are able to deduce non-trivial invariants attached to an infinitely wildly ramified tower by considering limits of invariants of tame subtowers, cf. e.g. Proposition 3.8.

Notation. Let us collect the notations used throughout the paper. Let K be a number field, i.e., a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}$. Then Σ_K is the set of all primes (archimedean or not) of K, $S_\infty := S_\infty(K)$ is the set of archimedean primes of K and $S^f := S \smallsetminus S_\infty(K)$ for any set S of primes of K. For $S, R \subseteq \Sigma_K$, K_S^R is the maximal extension of K unramified outside S and completely split in R. For a prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of K we write $\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}$ for its norm over $\mathbb{Q}$. Further, D_K, h_K, Reg_K are the absolute discriminant, the class number, the regulator of K and $g_K := \log |D_K|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is the genus of K. For a finite ramified extension L/K we set $g_{L/K} := \log |\mathrm{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}} D_{L/K}|^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

If L/K is a Galois extension and $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a prime of L, then $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},L/K} \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{L/K}$ denotes the decomposition subgroup of $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$. If $\mathfrak{p} := \bar{\mathfrak{p}}|_K$ is the restriction of $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ to K, then we sometimes write $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}}$ or simply $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ instead of $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},L/K}$.

A prime always mean a non-archimedean prime.

Outline of the paper. In Section 2, we consider the approach to the local correspondence at the boundary via Iwasawa theory. In Section 3 we show how to use results of Tsfasman-Vlăduţ to deduce information on wildly ramified towers. In Section 4 we characterize decomposition subgroups inside $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ using certain invariants attached to intermediate fields. In Section 5 we prove our main result Theorem 1.3 and in Section 6 we show how to reconstruct the p-adic volume of the unit lattice from $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$.

2. Decomposition subgroups of primes at the boundary

In this section, we use Iwasawa theory, to strengthen results from [Iv14] significantly under assumption of the Greenberg conjecture. We are going to prove Theorem 1.1 from the introduction.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume the Greenberg conjecture holds for all involved number fields and for the fixed prime p. Let K be a number field, $S \supseteq S_p \cup S_\infty$. Then*

$$(G_{K,S}, p) \rightsquigarrow (D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} \hookrightarrow G_{K,S})_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in S^f \smallsetminus S_p}.$$

Proof. By [Iv14] Proposition 2.4, the intersections of the p-Sylow subgroups inside the decomposition subgroups $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}}$ of primes $\mathfrak{p} \in S^f \smallsetminus S_p$ are not open in any of them. This implies that it is enough to prove the theorem after replacing K by a finite subextension contained in K_S (cf. [Iv14] Remark 1.2). Thus we may assume that $\mu_p \subseteq K$.

Let K_∞/K be the compositum of all $\mathbb{Z}_p$-extensions of K. Then the Galois group $\Gamma := \mathrm{G}_{K_\infty/K}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_p^d$ with $d = r_2 + 1 + \delta_p(K)$, where $\delta_p(K)$ is the Leopoldt defect of K. Let

$$\Lambda := \mathbb{Z}_p[\![\Gamma]\!] \cong \mathbb{Z}_p[\![T_1, \ldots, T_d]\!]$$

be the corresponding Iwasawa algebra. Introduce the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} M_\infty &= \text{maximal abelian pro-}p\text{-extension of } K_\infty \text{ unramified outside } S_p \cup S_\infty \\ M_{\infty,S} &= \text{maximal abelian pro-}p\text{-extension of } K_\infty \text{ unramified outside } S \\ Y &= \mathrm{G}_{M_\infty/K_\infty} \\ Y_S &= \mathrm{G}_{M_{\infty,S}/K_\infty}\,. \end{aligned}$$

For a prime $\mathfrak{p} \in S$, let $\Gamma_\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \Gamma$ denote the decomposition subgroup of $\mathfrak{p}$. The next lemma shows how the Iwasawa-theoretic result [NSW08] 11.3.5 generalizes to K_∞/K. Let $I(K_\mathfrak{p}(p)/K_\mathfrak{p})$ denote the inertia subgroup of the Galois group of the extension $K_\mathfrak{p}(p)/K_\mathfrak{p}$ and let $\mathbb{Z}_p(1)$ denote the first Tate-twist and $\mathrm{Ind}_{\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}}^{\Gamma}$ the compact induction functor from compact $\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}$-modules to compact Γ-modules, as explained in [NSW08] in the text preceeding 11.3.5.

Lemma 2.1. *There is a canonical exact sequence of Λ-modules*

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}\in(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K)} \mathrm{Ind}_{\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}}^{\Gamma} \mathbb{Z}_p(1) \to Y_S \to Y \to 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. As the weak Leopoldt conjecture holds for the cyclotomic $\mathbb{Z}_p$-extension, it also holds for K_∞/K ([Ng83] Corollary 2.9). Hence, exactly as in the proof of [NSW08] 11.3.5 we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \to \varprojlim_{U\subseteq\Gamma} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}\in(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(L)} I(K_\mathfrak{p}(p)/K_\mathfrak{p})_{\mathrm{G}_{L,\mathfrak{p}}} \to Y_S \to Y \to 0,$$

where the limit is taken over all open subgroups $U \subseteq \Gamma$, L is the subfield of K_∞ corresponding to U and $\mathrm{G}_{L,\mathfrak{p}}$ is the decomposition subgroup of $\mathfrak{p}$ in the extension $K_{S_p\cup S_\infty}(p)/L$. As K_∞ contains the cyclotomic p-extension of K, we have $\Gamma_\mathfrak{p} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$. We have $K_\infty \subseteq K_{S_p\cup S_\infty}(p)$, the decomposition subgroup of a prime $\mathfrak{p} \in S^f \smallsetminus S_p$ in $K_{S_p\cup S_\infty}(p)/K_\infty$ is trivial and $I(K_\mathfrak{p}(p)/K_\mathfrak{p}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_p(1)$. Hence the lemma follows. □

Observe that $(G_{K,S}, p) \rightsquigarrow \Gamma, \Lambda$, the Λ-module Y_S. Define the Λ-module V by

$$V := \ker(Y_S \to Y) = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}\in(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K)} \mathrm{Ind}_{\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}}^{\Gamma} \mathbb{Z}_p(1).$$

Lemma 2.2. $(G_{K,S}, p) \rightsquigarrow$ *the sequence* (2.1) *of Λ-modules and, in particular, the Λ-module V.*

Proof. By [LN00] Theorem 3.2 and as $\mu_p \subseteq K$, the $\mathbb{Z}_p$-rank of $\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}$ is ≥ 2 for $\mathfrak{p} \in S_p(K)$, hence the conditions of [LN00] Proposition 3.6 (cf. also [LN00] Theorem 4.4) resp. [McCal01] Corollary 14 are satisfied and we deduce that the Greenberg conjecture is equivalent to Y being Λ-torsion free. On the other side, $\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}\in(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K)} \mathrm{Ind}_{\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}}^{\Gamma} \mathbb{Z}_p(1)$ is a torsion Λ-module, hence it is exactly the Λ-torsion submodule of Y_S. This determines it intrinsically by $(G_{K,S}, p)$. □

Lemma 2.3. $(G_{K,S}, p) \rightsquigarrow \sharp(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K)$.

Proof. Let χ be a $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$-valued (continuous) character of Γ and $\mathbb{Z}_p(\chi)$ the corresponding Λ-module. By Frobenius reciprocity we have:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_\Gamma(V, \mathbb{Z}_p(\chi)) = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}\in(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K)} \mathrm{Hom}_\Gamma(\mathrm{Ind}_{\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}}^{\Gamma} \mathbb{Z}_p(1), \mathbb{Z}_p(\chi)) = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}\in(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K)} \mathrm{Hom}_{\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbb{Z}_p(1), \mathbb{Z}_p(\chi)).$$

Thus $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{Z}_\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{Hom}_\Gamma(\mathrm{V}, \mathbb{Z}_\mathrm{p}(\chi)) \leq \sharp(\mathrm{S}^\mathrm{f} \smallsetminus \mathrm{S}_\mathrm{p})(\mathrm{K})$ with equality if and only if $\chi|_{\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}}$ agrees with the cyclotomic character on $\Gamma_\mathfrak{p}$. Thus

$$\sharp(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K) = \max_\chi \mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{Z}_\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{Hom}_\Gamma(\mathrm{V}, \mathbb{Z}_\mathrm{p}(\chi)),$$

where χ goes through all continuous $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$-valued characters of Γ. This and Lemma 2.2 finish the proof. □

Now we can prove Theorem 1.1 using methods from [Iv14]. Applying Lemma 2.3 to open subgroups $U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$, we obtain the numbers $\sharp(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(L)$ for all intermediate subfields $K_S/L/K$. Let $U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ be an open subgroup. Let

$$V_0 := \bigcap_{V \subseteq U} V, \tag{2.2}$$

where the intersection is taken over all open normal subgroups V of U, such that U/V is abelian of exponent p and such that $\sharp(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K_S^V) = (V : U)\sharp(S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K_S^U)$. Thus $K_S^{V_0}/K_S^U$ is the maximal abelian extension of K_S^U of exponent p, which is unramified outside S and completely split in $S^f \smallsetminus S_p$. Let $L = K_S^U$ and consider the natural surjection

$$t_{p,U} \colon U \twoheadrightarrow U/V_0 = \mathrm{G}(L_S^{S^f \smallsetminus S_p}/L)^{\mathrm{ab}}/p.$$

As in [Iv14] Definition 2.1, let us say that a pro-finite group is of *p-decomposition group* if it is a non-abelian pro-p Demushkin group of rank 2. Explicitly, such a group is necessarily isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_p \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_p$, such that the corresponding map $\mathbb{Z}_p \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}_p) \cong \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ is injective. We have a variation of [Iv14] Proposition 3.5.

Lemma 2.4. *Let H be a group of p-decomposition type inside $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *$H \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ for some $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in S^f \smallsetminus S_p$*

(ii) *For any $U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ open: $H \subseteq U \Rightarrow H \subseteq \ker(t_{p,U} \colon U \twoheadrightarrow U/V_0)$, where V_0 is as in (2.2).*

The prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ in (i) is unique.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Assume $H \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ for some $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in S^f \smallsetminus S_p$. By construction, $K_S^{V_0}/K_S^U$ is completely decomposed in $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}|_{K_S^U}$. Thus $H \subseteq V_0$.
(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Let H be given and let $H \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ be an open subgroup. Let V_0 be as in (2.2). Then $K_S^{V_0}/K_S^U$ contains the maximal unramified abelian extension of K_S^U of exponent p, which is completely split in S. Thus S-version of the principal ideal theorem (as in the proof of the (a) $\Rightarrow$ (c)-part of [Iv14] Proposition 3.5) implies:

$$\varinjlim_{H \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}} \mathrm{Cl_S}(\mathrm{K_S^U})/\mathrm{p} = 0.$$

Now the proof can be finished as in [Iv14] Proposition 3.5. □

For $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in (S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K_S)$, the p-Sylow subgroups of $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ are exactly the subgroups of p-decomposition type. Thus by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 we obtain for any open subgroup $U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$:

$$(\mathrm{G}_{K,S}, p) \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Syl}_p(U, S^f \smallsetminus S_p) := \left\{ H \subseteq U \colon \ H \text{ is a } p\text{-Sylow subgroup of } D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}, K_S/K_S^U} \text{ with } \bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in S^f \smallsetminus S_p \right\}$$

Now the proof of Theorem 1.1 can be finished as in [Iv14] Section 3.4. □

3. Invariants of infinite Galois towers of number fields

3.1. **Preliminaries: Tsfasman-Vlăduţ theorem.**

We will make use of the generalized Brauer-Siegel theorem proven by Tsfasman-Vlăduţ [TV02] and extended further by Zykin [Zy05], so let us recall their results. Tsfasman and Vlăduţ work with asymptotically exact *families* of number fields. We need only the special case of infinite number fields (equivalently, of towers of number fields). Let $\mathscr{K}$ be an infinite number field, i.e., an algebraic extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ of infinite degree. We can choose a tower

$$\mathbb{Q} \subsetneq K_0 \subsetneq K_1 \subsetneq K_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathscr{K}$$

of subfields, finite over $\mathbb{Q}$, such that $\mathscr{K} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$. Such towers are clearly not unique. All results in this section (and also later on) depend only on $\mathscr{K}$, not on the choice of the tower. For a number field K, set

- $\Phi_\alpha(K) := \{\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_K \colon \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p} = \alpha\}$ if α is a rational prime power

- $\Phi_\alpha(K)$ is the set of real resp. complex primes of K, if $\alpha = \mathbb{R}$ resp. $\mathbb{C}$.

For $\mathscr{K}, K_n$ as above and α either a rational prime power or $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, define

$$\phi_\alpha(\mathscr{K}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sharp\Phi_\alpha(K_n)}{g_{K_n}}.$$

Then [TV02] Lemma 2.4 shows that this limit exists for each α (i.e., $\{K_n\}_n$ is an *asymptotically exact* family). Moreover, [TV02] Lemma 2.5 shows that these limits depend only on $\mathscr{K}$ and α and not on the choice of the tower. Further, $\mathscr{K}$ is called *asymptotically good*, if there exists an α such that $\phi_\alpha(\mathscr{K}) \neq 0$, and *asymptotically bad* otherwise. Also define

$$\mathrm{BS}(\mathscr{K}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log(h_{K_n} \operatorname{Reg}_{K_n})}{g_{K_n}}.$$

(We will see in a moment that this notation makes sense). A finite extension L/K is called *almost normal*, if there are subextensions $L = K_n \supseteq K_{n-1} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq K_0 = K$, such that K_{i+1}/K_i is normal. An infinite extension $\mathscr{K}/K$ is called almost normal, if it is the limit of a tower of finite almost normal extensions. The following generalization of the classical Brauer-Siegel theorem is shown by Tsfasman-Vlăduţ in the asymptotically good case and also under GRH and then by Zykin in the remaining asymptotically bad unconditional case.

Theorem 3.1 ([TV02] GRH Corollary D, Corollary F; [Zy05] Corollary 3)**.** *Let $\mathscr{K}$ be an infinite number field and let $\{K_n\}_n$ be a tower of subextensions of $\mathscr{K}$, such that $K_n \subsetneq K_{n+1}$ for all n and $\mathscr{K} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} K_n$. Assume that at least one of the following holds:*

- *each K_n is almost normal over $\mathbb{Q}$, or*
- *generalized Riemann hypothesis holds for each K_n.*

Then $\mathrm{BS}(\mathscr{K})$ exists, depends only on $\mathscr{K}$, not on K_n's and

$$\mathrm{BS}(\mathscr{K}) = 1 + \sum_q \phi_q(\mathscr{K}) \log \frac{q}{q-1} - \phi_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathscr{K}) \log 2 - \phi_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathscr{K}) \log 2\pi,$$

where the sum is taken over all rational prime powers.

Also observe that by [TV02] Theorem H (and GRH Theorem G) $\mathrm{BS}(\mathscr{K})$ is always finite. The term on the right side in Theorem 3.1 is closely related with the value at 1 of the zeta function of $\mathscr{K}$ (which is defined in [TV02]). For an infinite number field $\mathscr{K}$, satisfying one of the conditions from the theorem, we define:

$$\lambda(\mathscr{K}) := \mathrm{BS}(\mathscr{K}) - 1 + \phi_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathscr{K}) \log 2 + \phi_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathscr{K}) \log 2\pi = \sum_q \phi_q(\mathscr{K}) \log \frac{q}{q-1}. \tag{3.1}$$

For an infinite extension $\mathscr{K}/K$ with $\mathscr{K} = \bigcup_{n>0} K_n$ and $K_{n+1} \supseteq K_n \supseteq K$ for all $n > 0$, define:

$$\mu(\mathscr{K}/K) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{[K_n : K]}{g_{K_n}}.$$

The following two lemmas below are closely related to [HM01] Lemma 5, Definition 6 and the invariant μ is related to the root discriminant $\mathrm{rd}_K := |D_{K/\mathbb{Q}}|^{\frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let K be a number field and $\mathscr{K}/K$ an infinite Galois extension. Let $(K_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a tower corresponding to $\mathscr{K}/K$, consisting of Galois subextensions with $K = K_0$. Then*

$$\mu(\mathscr{K}/K) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{[K_n : K]}{g_{K_n}} \geq 0$$

exists, is finite and depends only on $\mathscr{K}/K$, not on the choice of the tower. If moreover, $\mathscr{K}/K$ is unramified outside a finite set S of primes of K and only tamely ramified in S, then $\mu(\mathscr{K}/K) > 0$.

Proof. This follows from the last statement of Lemma 3.3 below. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let L/K be a finite Galois extension, which is unramified outside S_∞ a set $S^f = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r\}$ of primes of K, and let $\mathfrak{p}_i\mathcal{O}_L = \prod_{j=1}^{g_i} \mathfrak{P}_{ij}^{e_i}$, such that $[L:K] = e_i f_i g_i$, where f_i is the inertia degree of $\mathfrak{P}_{ij}/\mathfrak{p}_i$ for some (any) j. Then*

$$N_{K/\mathbb{Q}} D_{L/K} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_i^{[L:K](1-\frac{1}{e_i}+\frac{\beta_i}{e_i})},$$

with some $\beta_i \geq 0$ and $\beta_i = 0 \Leftrightarrow L/K$ is tamely ramified in $\mathfrak{p}_i$. Moreover, one has

$$\frac{g_L}{[L:K]} = g_K + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{r}(1 - \frac{1}{e_i} + \frac{\beta_i}{e_i}) \log \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_i.$$

Proof. Let $\delta_{L/K}$ be the different of L/K. Then the $\mathfrak{P}_{ij}$-valuation of $\delta_{L/K}$ is $e_i - 1 + \sum_{u=1}^{\infty}(\sharp D_{\mathfrak{P}_{ij}/\mathfrak{p}_i,u} - 1)$, where $D_{\mathfrak{P}_{ij}/\mathfrak{p}_i,u}$ denote the higher ramification subgroups in the lower numbering ([Se79] Chap. IV Proposition 4). Let $\beta_i := \sum_{u=1}^{\infty}(\sharp D_{\mathfrak{P}_{ij}/\mathfrak{p}_i,u} - 1)$. As $D_{L/K} = \mathrm{N}_{L/K}\delta_{L/K}$, we get

$$\mathrm{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}} D_{L/K} = \mathrm{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}\mathrm{N}_{L/K}\delta_{L/K} = \mathrm{N}_{L/\mathbb{Q}}\delta_{L/K} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_i^{g_i f_i (e_i - 1 + \beta_i)} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_i^{[L:K](1-\frac{1}{e_i}+\frac{\beta_i}{e_i})}.$$

It is clear that $\beta_i = 0 \Leftrightarrow L/K$ is tamely ramified in $\mathfrak{p}_i$. Now taking the logarithm of the formula $D_{L/\mathbb{Q}} = D_{K/\mathbb{Q}}^{[L:K]} \mathrm{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}} D_{L/K}$ gives the last statement of the lemma. □

3.2. **Relative version of the invariants.**

Let L/K be a finite extension. Having no chance to control neither $D_{K/\mathbb{Q}}$, nor the wild part of $D_{L/K}$, we are still able to control the tame part of the norm of the relative discriminant $|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}} D_{L/K}|$ (by 'control' we mean, that the information is encoded in the Galois groups). Therefore, we introduce relative versions of invariants from Section 3.1. For L/K finite and ramified, set

$$g_{L/K} := \log |\mathrm{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}} D_{L/K}|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then $g_L = g_{L/\mathbb{Q}} = [L:K] g_K + g_{L/K}$. Assume now the tower $\mathscr{K} = \bigcup_n K_n/K$ is ramified, i.e., $g_{K_n/K} > 0$ for $n \gg 0$). We define:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) &:= \lim_n \frac{[K_n:K]}{g_{K_n/K}} \\
\phi_{\alpha,\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) &:= \lim_n \frac{\sharp\Phi_\alpha(K_n)}{g_{K_n/K}} \\
\mathrm{BS}_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) &:= \lim_n \frac{\log(h_{K_n} \mathrm{Reg}_{K_n})}{g_{K_n/K}} \\
\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) &:= \mathrm{BS}_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) - 1 + \phi_{\mathbb{R},\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)\log 2 + \phi_{\mathbb{C},\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)\log 2\pi.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathscr{K}/K$ be a ramified tower. Then*

(i) *$\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K), \phi_{\alpha,\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K), \mathrm{BS}_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)$ and $\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)$ exist and are independent of the choice of the K_n's.*

(ii) *One has $\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) < \infty$ and $\mu(\mathscr{K}/K) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) = 0$.*

(iii) *For $* \in \{\mu, \phi_\alpha, \mathrm{BS}\}$ one has:*

$$*_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) = *(\mathscr{K}/K)(1 + g_K \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)).$$

Proof. For $n \gg 0$, $g_{K_n/K}$ is defined and we have:

$$\frac{g_{K_n}}{[K_n:K]} = \frac{g_{K_n/K} + [K_n:K] g_K}{[K_n:K]} = \frac{g_{K_n/K}}{[K_n:K]} + g_K.$$

As for $n \to \infty$ the limit on the left side exists and is > 0, also the limit on the right side exists and is > 0. Take n_0 big enough such that K_{n_0}/K is ramified, then a similar computation shows that $\frac{g_{K_n/K}}{[K_n:K]} \geq g_{K_{n_0}/K}$, in particular the limit of $\frac{g_{K_n/K}}{[K_n:K]}$ is > 0. Going to this limit we obtain:

$$\mu(\mathscr{K}/K)^{-1} = \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)^{-1} + g_K. \tag{3.2}$$

The left hand side is ∞ if and only if the right hand side is. Thus $\mu(\mathscr{K}/K) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) = 0$. This completes the proof of (ii). Also (iii) for $* = \mu$ follows from (3.2). Further, as $\mu(\mathscr{K}/K)$ depends only on $\mathscr{K}/K$, not on K_n's, the same holds for $\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)$. We compute:

$$(1 + g_K\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K))\phi_\alpha(\mathscr{K}/K) = (1 + g_K \lim_n \frac{[K_n : K]}{g_{K_n/K}}) \lim_n \frac{\sharp\Phi_\alpha(K_n)}{g_{K_n}} = \lim_n \frac{\sharp\Phi_\alpha(K_n)}{g_{K_n/K}} = \phi_{\alpha,\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K).$$

As the limits in the second term exist and are independent of the choice of the tower, the same holds true for the limit defining $\phi_{\alpha,\mathrm{rel}}$. Analogously, we deduce existence and independence of the K_n's of $\mathrm{BS}_{\mathrm{rel}}$ and part (iii) for $* = \mathrm{BS}$. Now, existence of λ_{rel} and its independence of the choice of K_n's follows then from the definition of λ_{rel}. This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

For a Galois tower $\mathscr{K}/K$ and for α either a rational prime power or $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ define

$$\psi_\alpha(\mathscr{K}/K) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sharp\Phi_\alpha(K_n)}{[K_n : K]}.$$

Assume an infinite tower $\mathscr{K}/K$ is given with $0 < \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) < \infty$. Then we have:

$$\psi_\alpha(\mathscr{K}/K) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sharp\Phi_\alpha(K_n)}{[K_n : K]} = \left(\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sharp\Phi_\alpha(K_n)}{g_{K_n/K}}\right) \cdot \left(\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{[K_n : K]}{g_{K_n/K}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{\phi_{\alpha,\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)}$$

(in particular, $\psi_\alpha(\mathscr{K}/K)$ exists and is independent of the choice of K_n's in this case).

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\mathscr{K}/K$ be a tower with $0 < \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K) < \infty$. Then:*

$$\frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)} = g_K + \sum_q \psi_q(\mathscr{K}/K) \log \frac{q}{q-1}. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, both sides are non-negative and $< \infty$.

Proof. During the proof, for $* \in \{\mu, \mathrm{BS}, \phi_\alpha, \lambda\}$, $*$ always means $*(\mathscr{K})$ and $*_{\mathrm{rel}}$ always means $*_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}} + 1 &= \mathrm{BS}_{\mathrm{rel}} + \phi_{\mathbb{R},\mathrm{rel}} \log 2 + \phi_{\mathbb{C},\mathrm{rel}} \log 2\pi \\
&= (1 + g_K\mu_{\mathrm{rel}})(\mathrm{BS} + \phi_{\mathbb{R}} \log 2 + \phi_{\mathbb{C}} \log 2\pi) \\
&= (1 + g_K\mu_{\mathrm{rel}})(\lambda + 1) \\
&= (1 + g_K\mu_{\mathrm{rel}})(1 + \sum_q \phi_q \log \frac{q}{q-1}) \\
&= 1 + g_K\mu_{\mathrm{rel}} + \sum_q \phi_{q,\mathrm{rel}} \log \frac{q}{q-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting 1, dividing by μ_{rel} and applying the definition of ψ_q, we deduce (3.3). Now the right hand side of (3.3) is clearly ≥ 0. To show that the left hand side is $< \infty$, it is enough to show that $\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}} < \infty$. Therefore, consider the equality

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}} + 1 = (1 + g_K\mu_{\mathrm{rel}})(\lambda + 1),$$

from the proof of Proposition 3.5. By assumption we have $1 + g_K\mu_{\mathrm{rel}} < \infty$. Further, $\lambda < \infty$ follows from the upper bounds on BS proven in [TV02] Theorem H (cf. also GRH Theorem G). □

3.3. **Galois towers with non-vanishing μ_{rel}.**

Now we evaluate the right hand side of (3.3) in terms of Galois theory and norms of primes. Note that for a Galois extension $\mathscr{K}/K$ and a prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of K, the degree (and the ramification index and the

inertia degree) of the local extension $\mathscr{K}_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}/K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ does not depend on the choice of the prolongation $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $\mathfrak{p}$ to $\mathscr{K}$. This justifies the following definition.

Definition 3.6. For a Galois extension $\mathscr{K}/K$ and a prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of K let $f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{K}/K)$ resp. $e_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{K}/K)$ denote the inertia degree resp. the ramification index of a (any) prolongation of $\mathfrak{p}$ to $\mathscr{K}$. For an infinite Galois extension $\mathscr{K}/K$, we set

$$\beta(\mathscr{K}/K) := \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{K}/K)f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{K}/K)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{K}/K)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{K}/K)}-1}$$

(here and later, the sums are taken only over primes with finite absolute degree $e_{\mathfrak{p}}f_{\mathfrak{p}}$ in the tower $\mathscr{K}/K$).

Note that all summands are positive real numbers and if the sum converges, the convergence is absolute. In the following proposition and its proof we omit $\mathscr{K}/K$ from notation and write β instead of $\beta(\mathscr{K}/K)$, etc.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $\mathscr{K}/K$ be an infinite Galois extension such that $0<\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}<\infty$. Then*

$$\frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}} = g_K + \beta.$$

Proof. For a rational prime power q, a finite extension L/K and $\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f$, let

$$\Phi_{q,\mathfrak{p}}(L) = \{\mathfrak{q}\in\Sigma_L^f \colon \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{q}=q, \mathfrak{q} \text{ lies over } \mathfrak{p}\}.$$

Clearly, for given q and L, the set of all $\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f$ such that $\Phi_{q,\mathfrak{p}}(L)\neq\emptyset$ is finite and contained in $S_p(K<)$. Using this, we compute:

$$\psi_q = \lim_n \frac{\sharp\Phi_q(K_n)}{[K_n:K]} = \lim_n \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f} \frac{\sharp\Phi_{q,\mathfrak{p}}(K_n)}{[K_n:K]} = \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f} \lim_n \frac{\sharp\Phi_{q,\mathfrak{p}}(K_n)}{[K_n:K]} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f \\ e_{\mathfrak{p}}f_{\mathfrak{p}}<\infty \\ \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}=q}} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}f_{\mathfrak{p}}}.$$

Thus by Proposition 3.5 we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}} - g_K &= \sum_q \psi_q \log\frac{q}{q-1} = \sum_q \Big(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f \\ e_{\mathfrak{p}}f_{\mathfrak{p}}<\infty \\ \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}=q}} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}f_{\mathfrak{p}}}\Big)\log\frac{q}{q-1} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f \\ e_{\mathfrak{p}}f_{\mathfrak{p}}<\infty}} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}f_{\mathfrak{p}}} \log\frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}-1} = \beta. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

3.4. **Galois towers with arbitrary $\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}<\infty$.**

Let us deduce invariants of wildly ramified towers.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\mathscr{K}/K$ be an infinite Galois extension with $\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{K}/K)<\infty$. Let $H\subseteq \mathrm{G}_{\mathscr{K}/K}$ be a closed normal subgroup with fixed field $\mathscr{K}^H$. Assume for any finite Galois subextension $\mathscr{K}^H/L/K$, we are given an ascending family $(\mathscr{L}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of infinite Galois subextensions $\mathscr{K}/\mathscr{L}_n/L$. Write $\mathscr{L}_\infty := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathscr{L}_n$, $\mathscr{L}_n^H := \mathscr{L}_n\cap\mathscr{K}^H$ for $n<\infty$ and $\mathscr{L}_\infty^H := \bigcup_n \mathscr{L}_n^H$. Assume that for all L we have:*

- *$\mathscr{L}_n^H/L$ is infinite, $0<\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)<\infty$ and $0<\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L)<\infty$ for $0\ll n<\infty$.*

Then for any finite Galois subextension $\mathscr{K}^H/L/K$, we have (in particular, the limit on the left side exists):

$$\lim_n \left(\frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L)}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L)} - \frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}\right) = \beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty^H/L) - \beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L).$$

Moreover, assume $\mathscr{L}_\infty^H/K$ is Galois for any L and $\bigcup_{\mathscr{K}^H/L/K}\mathscr{L}_\infty$ has no primes of finite norm. Then we have

$$\lim_{\mathscr{K}^H/L/K} \frac{1}{[L:K]}(\beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty^H/L) - \beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L)) = \beta(\mathscr{K}^H/K).$$

Proof. To prove the first statement, fix some finite Galois subextension $\mathscr{K}^H/L/K$. As $0 < \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L) < \infty$, we know that $\beta(\mathscr{L}_n/L)$ exists by Proposition 3.7. Moreover, for $m \leq n$, we have $\beta(\mathscr{L}_m/L) \geq \beta(\mathscr{L}_n/L) \geq 0$, hence $\beta(\mathscr{L}_n/L)$ form a monotone decreasing, bounded from below by 0, hence convergent sequence and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_n \beta(\mathscr{L}_n/L) &= \lim_n \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_L^f} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}/L)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}-1} \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_L^f} \lim_n \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}-1} \qquad (3.4) \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_L^f} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L)f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L)}-1} = \beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L).
\end{aligned}$$

In the second equation we are allowed to interchange the limit with the sum by the dominated convergence theorem, as the summands form a monotone decreasing sequence for $n \to \infty$. In particular, $\beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L)$ exists. Analogously, we deduce that $\beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty^H/L)$ exists and that

$$\beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty^H/L) = \lim_n \beta(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L). \qquad (3.5)$$

For any $n \geq 0$, we have by Proposition 3.7:

$$\frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L)}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L)} - \frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)} = \beta(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L) - \beta(\mathscr{L}_n/L). \qquad (3.6)$$

Since by (3.4) and (3.5) the limit for $n \to \infty$ of the right side of (3.6) exists, also the limit of the left side exists and we have

$$\lim_n \left(\frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L)}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L)} - \frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}{\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_n/L)}\right) = \lim_n \beta(\mathscr{L}_n^H/L) - \lim_n \beta(\mathscr{L}_n/L) = \beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty^H/L) - \beta(\mathscr{L}_\infty/L).$$

The first statement of the proposition follows. The second statement follows from Lemma 3.9 which has to be applied twice: first to $\overline{\mathscr{L}} := \bigcup_{\mathscr{K}^H/L/K} \mathscr{L}_\infty$ and $\mathscr{L}_L := \mathscr{L}_\infty$ and then to $\overline{\mathscr{L}} := \bigcup_{\mathscr{K}^H/L/K} \mathscr{L}_\infty^H = \mathscr{K}^H$ and $\mathscr{L}_L := \mathscr{L}_\infty^H$. □

We have the following continuity property of β:

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\overline{\mathscr{L}}/K$ be a Galois extension, let L/K run through an increasing family $\mathscr{F}$ of finite Galois subextensions of $\overline{\mathscr{L}}/K$ and for each L, let $\mathscr{L}_L/L$ be a subextension of $\overline{\mathscr{L}}/L$, such that $\mathscr{L}_L/K$ is infinite Galois and $\bigcup_L \mathscr{L}_L = \overline{\mathscr{L}}$. Then*

$$\lim_{L\in\mathscr{F}} \frac{1}{[L:K]}\beta(\mathscr{L}_L/L) = \beta(\overline{\mathscr{L}}/K).$$

Proof. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_L \frac{1}{[L:K]}\beta(\mathscr{L}_L/L) &= \lim_L \frac{1}{[L:K]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_L\in\Sigma_L^f} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_L^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)}-1} \\
&= \lim_L \frac{1}{[L:K]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f} \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_L\in S_{\mathfrak{p}}(L)} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_L^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)}-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where $S_{\mathfrak{p}}(L)$ denotes the set of all primes of L lying over $\mathfrak{p}$. Choosing now one representative $\mathfrak{p}_L \in S_{\mathfrak{p}}(L)$ (note that as $\mathscr{L}_L/K$ is assumed to be Galois, all these representatives have the same properties in the tower $\mathscr{L}_L/L$) and noting that $\sharp S_{\mathfrak{p}}(L) = \frac{[L:K]}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}(L/K)f_{\mathfrak{p}}(L/K)}$, we see that the above expression is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &= \lim_L \frac{1}{[L:K]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f} \frac{[L:K]}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}(L/K)f_{\mathfrak{p}}(L/K)} \left(\frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_L^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_L^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)} - 1} \right) \\ &= \lim_L \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Sigma_K^f} \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_L/K)f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_L/K)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_L/K)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{L}_L/L)} - 1} \\ &= \beta(\overline{\mathscr{L}}/K), \end{aligned}$$

where we used transitivity of $e_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $f_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for the first and the absolute convergence of the involved series and $\bigcup_L \mathscr{L}_L = \overline{\mathscr{L}}$ for the last equation. Again, as in the proof of Proposition 3.8, we are allowed to interchange the limit and the sum. □

4. Characterization of decomposition subgroups

Let S be a finite set of primes of K with $S_p \cup S_\infty \subseteq S$. We now consider the question of how to describe decomposition subgroups of primes outside S using anabelian information.

4.1. **Some preliminaries.**

For a pro-finite group H, let H_p denote a pro-p-Sylow subgroup of it. Consider the following condition on K, S:

(C1) for any two different primes $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}, \bar{\mathfrak{q}}$ of K_S, the intersection $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p} \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{q}},p} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$ is not open in $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$.

Here $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$ denotes a pro-p-Sylow subgroup of the decomposition subgroup $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ of $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ in K_S/K. Note that (C1) for K, S implies (C1) for L, S, where $K_S/L/K$ is a finite subextension. Note also that due to $S_p \cup S_\infty \subseteq S$, the decomposition subgroup $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ at a prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \notin S(K_S)$ is pro-cyclic with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup. We have the following standard lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume (C1) holds for K, S.*

(i) *If $x \in \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ normalizes an open subgroup of $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$, then $x \in D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$.*
(ii) *If $Z \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ is an abelian subgroup with infinite cyclic pro-p-Sylow subgroup, then there is at most one prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of K_S (which then has to lie outside $S(K_S)$), such that $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is open. Moreover, in that case, we have $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$.*

Proof. (i): We have $xD_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}x^{-1} = D_{x\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$. Let $U \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$ be an open subgroup normalized by x. Thus $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p} \supseteq U = xUx^{-1} \subseteq D_{x\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$, i.e., the open subgroup U of $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$ is contained in the intersection of $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$ and $D_{x\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$. By (C1) we get $x\bar{\mathfrak{p}} = \bar{\mathfrak{p}}$, i.e., $x \in D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$.

(ii): Let $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ be a prime, such that $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is open. In particular, $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$ is open. As Z is abelian, Z normalizes $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p}$, hence $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ by part (i) of the lemma. Note that $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ must lie outside S, as for $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in S(K_S)$, the p-Sylow subgroup $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},p} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_p$ do not contain an open abelian subgroup. If $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i}$ is open for $i = 1, 2$, then $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i}$ and hence $Z_p \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i,p}$ (as $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i}$ is abelian). Thus $\mathbb{Z}_p \cong Z_p \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_1,p} \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_2,p}$. As $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i,p} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$, we see that $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_1,p} \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_2,p} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_1,p}$ must be open. By condition (C1), $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_1 = \bar{\mathfrak{p}}_2$. □

Unfortunately, condition (C1) is not enough to apply our method to K_S/K with S finite, and we have to assume either one of the following stronger conditions additionally to (C1). For a subgroup Z of a pro-finite group U, we denote by $\langle\langle Z \rangle\rangle_U$ the smallest normal closed subgroup of U containing Z.

(C2) Condition (C1) holds and if $Z \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ is a closed pro-cyclic subgroup with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup, then the following holds:

- If $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is open for a prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of K_S lying over $\mathfrak{p}$ (necessarily $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$), then
$$\lim_{K_S^Z/L/K} \beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(K_S^Z/K)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(K_S^Z/K)} - 1},$$
where $Z_L := \langle\langle Z \rangle\rangle_{\mathrm{G}_{K_S/L}}$ and $f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(K_S^Z/K) = (D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} : Z)$ is the index of $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ in K_S^Z/K.
- If $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is not open in $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ for any $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$, then
$$\lim_{K_S^Z/L/K} \beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = 0.$$

(C3) For any finite subextension $K_S/L/K$, for any two primes $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{q}$ of L, the decomposition subgroup of $\mathfrak{q}$ in the extension $K_S^{\{\mathfrak{p}\}}/L$ is infinite.

Lemma 4.2. *Condition (C3) for K, S implies (C1) and the first part of (C2), i.e., for any closed pro-cyclic subgroup $Z \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup, if $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is open for a prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of K_S, then*
$$\lim_{K_S^Z/L/K} \beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(K_S^Z/K)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(K_S^Z/K)} - 1}.$$

Proof. (C1) easily follows from (C3). Assume now, $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is open for some $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ with restriction $\mathfrak{p}$ to K. Then necessarily $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \notin S(K_S)$. Let $Z \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ be open and write $L := K_S^U$ and $Z_L := \langle\langle Z \rangle\rangle_U$. Let $\mathfrak{p}_L$ denote the restriction of $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ to L. Then $Z_L \subseteq \langle\langle D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_L} \rangle\rangle_U$ and by (C3) we see that any prime $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p}_L$ of L has infinite degree in the Galois tower $K_S^{\langle\langle D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_L} \rangle\rangle_U}/L$ and hence also in the Galois tower $K_S^{Z_L}/L$. Thus
$$\beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = \frac{1}{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(K_S^{Z_L}/L)} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_L^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(K_S^{Z_L}/L)}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_L^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(K_S^{Z_L}/L)} - 1}.$$
For $U \supseteq Z$ small enough, we have $U \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} = Z$, hence $f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(L/K) = (D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} : Z) = f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(K_S^Z/K)$ and $f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = e_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = 1$. Thus $\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_L^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(K_S^{Z_L}/L)} = (\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(L/K)})^{f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(K_S^{Z_L}/L)} = \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}(K_S^Z/K)}$ and the lemma follows. □

Definition 4.3. Let $U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ be an open subgroup and $L := K_S^U$. Let $H \triangleleft U$ be a closed normal subgroup, which is not open. We say that a prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of L **lies under** H, if for some (any) extension $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $\mathfrak{p}$ to K_S, the inclusion $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap H \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}}$ is open (equivalently, $[\mathfrak{p}_H \colon \mathfrak{p}] < \infty$, where $\mathfrak{p}_H := \bar{\mathfrak{p}}|_{K_S^H}$). For a set $R \subseteq \Sigma_L^f$, we define:
$$z_R(U;H) := \text{the number of primes in } L \text{ lying outside } R \text{ and under } H.$$

Proposition 4.4 (Criterion 1)**.** *Let $H \triangleleft U$, L be as in Definition 4.3. Assume that either $L/\mathbb{Q}$ is almost normal, or that generalized Riemann hypothesis holds for all involved number fields. Assume that (C3) holds for K, S. We have:*

(i) $z_S(U;H) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \beta(K_S^H/L) - \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in S^f(L)} \frac{1}{f_{\mathfrak{p}} e_{\mathfrak{p}}} \log \frac{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}}{\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}-1} = 0$ *(where $f_{\mathfrak{p}} := f_{\mathfrak{p}}(K_S^H/L)$, etc.).*

(ii) $z_S(U;H) > 1 \Leftrightarrow \exists H_1, H_2 \subseteq H$ *which are closed and normal in U such that $z_S(U;H_i) > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $z_S(U; H_1 \cap H_2) = 0$.*

Proof. (i) follows directly from the definition of β. (ii): Assume first $z_S(U;H) > 1$. Then there are two different primes $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2$ of L, both lying outside S and under H. For $i = 1, 2$ let $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i$ be an extension of $\mathfrak{p}_i$ to K_S and let $H_i := \langle\langle D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i/\mathfrak{p}_i} \cap H \rangle\rangle_U$ be the closed normal subgroup of U generated by $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i/\mathfrak{p}_i} \cap H$. Then obviously, $\mathfrak{p}_i$ lies under H_i, hence $z_S(U;H_i) > 0$. Further, for any prime $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{p}_1$ of L with some extension $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ to K_S, we have:
$$D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap H_i \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap \langle\langle D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_1/\mathfrak{p}_1} \rangle\rangle_U \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}},$$
and the second inclusion is not open by (C3). Hence (doing the same for $\mathfrak{p}_2$ instead of $\mathfrak{p}_1$) no prime lies under $H_1 \cap H_2$. In particular, $z_S(U; H_1 \cap H_2) = 0$.

Conversely, assume there are two closed subgroups $H_1, H_2 \subseteq H$, normal in U, such that $z_S(U;H_i) > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $z_S(U; H_1 \cap H_2) = 0$. Let $\mathfrak{p}_i$ be a prime of L lying outside S and under H_i. Then $\mathfrak{p}_i$ also lies under H. If we would have $\mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{p}_2 =: \mathfrak{p}$, then $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap H_i \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}}$ would be an open inclusion for

$i = 1, 2$. But then also $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap H_1 \cap H_2 \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}}$ would be open, i.e., $\mathfrak{p}$ would lie under $H_1 \cap H_2$, which contradicts $z_S(U; H_1 \cap H_2) = 0$. Thus $\mathfrak{p}_1 \neq \mathfrak{p}_2$, and hence $z_S(U; H) > 1$. □

4.2. **Subgroups of decomposition behavior.**

We now introduce candidates from decomposition subgroups. The definitions depend on which condition we pose on K_S/K.

Definition 4.5. Assume that (C2) holds for K_S/K. Let $Z \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ be a closed pro-cyclic subgroup with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup. We say that Z has **(C2)-decomposition behavior** if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{K_S^Z/L/K} \beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = C,$$

where $Z_L := \langle\langle Z \rangle\rangle_{\mathrm{G}_{L,S}}$.

Definition 4.6. Assume that (C3) holds for K_S/K. Let $Z \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ be a closed pro-cyclic subgroup with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup. We say that Z has **(C3)-decomposition behavior** if the following conditions are satisfied for all open subgroups $U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ containing Z:

(1) $z_S(U; \langle\langle Z \rangle\rangle_U) = 1$

(2) there is a constant $C > 0$ and an open subgroup $Z \subset U_0 \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$, such that if $Z \subset U \subseteq U_0$, then

$$\beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = C,$$

where $L := K_S^U$ and $Z_L := \langle\langle Z \rangle\rangle_U$.

Remark 4.7. From Lemma 4.2 and the proof of Theorem 4.8 one gets the impression that (C2) is the 'better' condition. Nevertheless, we do not know how to deduce the second part of (C2) from (C3) and therefore we work with both conditions separately.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $S \supseteq S_p \cup S_\infty$ be a finite set of primes of K. Assume that (C2) (resp. (C3)) holds for K, S. Assume that the generalized Riemannian hypothesis holds for all involved number fields. Let $Z \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ be a closed pro-cyclic subgroup with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup. Then Z has (C2)- (resp. (C3)-) decomposition behavior if and only if there is a prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of K_S, such that $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is open. In this case $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$, the prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ is unique and $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \notin S(K_S)$. Moreover, the norm of the restriction $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ to K is equal to*

$$\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p} = \frac{e^C}{e^C - 1},$$

where $C > 0$ is the constant attached to $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}}$ in Definition 4.5 (resp. 4.6).

Proof. Assume first (C2) holds for K, S. By Lemma 4.1, the following two statements about Z are equivalent: 'there is a prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of K_S such that $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is open' and 'there is a prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of K_S such that $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is open'. Thus in this case, the first statement of the theorem follows directly from (C2).

Now assume (C3) holds for K, S. Assume first there is a prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of K_S with restriction $\mathfrak{p}$ to K such that $Z \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}}$ is open. For any $Z \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ open with fixed field L, put $\mathfrak{p}_L := \bar{\mathfrak{p}}|_L$ and write $Z_L := \langle\langle Z \rangle\rangle_U$. Then $\mathfrak{p}_L$ lies under Z_L and not in $S(L)$. If a further prime $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p}_L$ of L with $\mathfrak{q} \notin S$ would lie under Z_L, then the composition $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{q}}/\mathfrak{q}} \cap Z_L \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{q}}/\mathfrak{q}} \cap \langle\langle D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_L} \rangle\rangle_U \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{q}}/\mathfrak{q}}$ would be open. Hence also the second inclusion would be open, and this contradicts (C3). This shows part (1) in Definition 4.6. As in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we see that $\beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L)$ gets constant (and > 0) if U is small enough, more precisely, if $U \cap D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} = Z$. This shows that Z has (C3)-decomposition behavior.

Conversely, assume Z has (C3)-decomposition behavior. Let $Z \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ be an open subgroup with fixed field L. By assumptions, there is a unique prime $\mathfrak{p}_L$ of L lying outside S and under Z_L. This uniqueness implies that if $Z \subseteq U' \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}^{\bullet}$ with fixed fields L', L, then $\mathfrak{p}_{L'}|_L = \mathfrak{p}_L$. Thus the sets $\{\mathfrak{p}_L\}$ with one element form a projective system, which limit is again a one element set, i.e., we obtain a unique prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of K_S (lying outside S) with $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}|_L = \mathfrak{p}_L$ for each L.

Let us compute the numbers $\beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L)$ for any open $Z \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K,S}$. By part (1) of Definition 4.6, the prime $\mathfrak{p}_L$ is the only one lying under Z_L, i.e., $\mathfrak{p}_L$ is the only prime having finite norm in $K_S^{Z_L}/L$. Set $f_U := f_{\mathfrak{p}_L}(K_S^{Z_L}/L)$ and $t := \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_L$. By definition of β we compute:

$$\beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = \frac{1}{f_U}\log\frac{t^{f_U}}{t^{f_U}-1}.$$

Fix now two open subgroups $Z \subseteq U' \subseteq U \subseteq U_0$ with fixed fields L', L, where U_0 is as in part (2) of Definition 4.6. Set $c := [\mathfrak{p}_{L'} : \mathfrak{p}_L] = (D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_L} : D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_{L'}})$. Then $\mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}_{L'} = \mathrm{N}\mathfrak{p}^c = t^c$ and by part (2) of Definition 4.6 we must have:

$$\frac{1}{f_{U'}}\log\frac{t^{cf_{U'}}}{t^{cf_{U'}}-1} = \beta(K_S^{Z_{L'}}/L') = \beta(K_S^{Z_L}/L) = \frac{1}{f_U}\log\frac{t^{f_U}}{t^{f_U}-1},$$

or, equivalently,

$$(c-1)\log t = \log\left(\frac{(t^{cf'_U}-1)^{1/f_{U'}}}{(t^{f_U}-1)^{1/f_U}}\right).$$

Applying exp and taking $f_U f_{U'}$-th power we obtain

$$t^{(c-1)f_U f_{U'}}(t^{f_U}-1)^{f_{U'}} = (t^{cf_{U'}}-1)^{f_U}.$$

All numbers in this equation are positive integers and if $c \neq 1$, then the left side would be divisible by t (which is a prime power > 1), whereas the right side would not. This contradiction shows $c = 1$ and therefore, the intersection $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap U$ is independent of the open subgroup $Z \subseteq U \subseteq U_0$. Hence

$$D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap Z = D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap \bigcap_{Z\subseteq U} U = D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}} \cap U_0$$

is open in $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_K}$. This finishes the proof of the first statement of the theorem.

Uniqueness of $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ follows from Lemma 4.1 as (C2), (C3) imply (C1). The p-Sylow subgroup of a decomposition subgroup of a prime in S is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_p \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_p$, hence do not contain any open abelian subgroup. Thus $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \notin S(K_S)$. Further, $Z \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ follows from Lemma 4.1. This shows the second statement of the theorem. The last statement follows directly from (C2) resp. is an elementary computation. □

Corollary 4.9. *With the assumptions as in Theorem 4.8, the decomposition subgroups inside* $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ *of primes lying outside* S *are exactly the maximal pro-cyclic subgroups of* $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ *with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup of (C2)- (resp. (C3)-) decomposition behavior.*

Proof. The $\mathbb{Z}_p$-cyclotomic extension of K is contained in K_S. Thus the decomposition subgroup inside $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ of any prime $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$ is pro-cyclic with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup. Now the corollary follows from Theorem 4.8 and Lemma 4.1. □

5. Anabelian geometry

The goal of this section is to apply the theory developed in Sections 3, 4 to anabelian geometry and to prove Theorem 1.3. Let K_S^{tm} denote the maximal tamely ramified subextension of K_S/K. First we need a further condition:

(C4) there is a finite subextension $K_S/M/K$, such that for each prime $\mathfrak{p} \notin S(M)$, there is no $M_S^{\mathrm{tm},\{\mathfrak{p}\}}/L/M$ finite, such that $M_S^{\{\mathfrak{p}\},\mathrm{tm}}/L$ is unramified (in particular, the extension $M_S^{\{\mathfrak{p}\},\mathrm{tm}}/M$ is infinite) and for any closed normal subgroup H of $\mathrm{G}_{M_S/M}$, which is generated by conjugates of one element, $\bigcup_{M_S^H/L/M} L_S^{\mathrm{tm}}$ has no prime of finite norm.

Remarks 5.1. Condition (C4) is in contrast to (C2),(C3) purely of technical nature. We are convinced that it can be removed or at least weakened. Here are two remarks concerning it:

(i) If M satisfies the requirements posed in (C4), then also any finite $K_S/M'/M$ does. If there would be some finite subextension M such that M_S^{tm} has no prime of finite norm, then everything would be much easier. But, we need not to assume this and indeed, the last condition required in (C4) is much weaker: if H is a normal subgroup of $\mathrm{G}_{M_S/M}$, generated by conjugates of one element, then the extension M_S^H/M is very big at least if M is totally imaginary (indeed, M_S^H/M contains at least $r_2(M)$ independent $\mathbb{Z}_p$-extensions of M).

(ii) Technically, we need (C4) for the crucial application of Proposition 3.8, which we are finally forced to apply to extensions $\mathscr{L}_n = L_S^{\mathrm{tm}}$ (constant for all n), as there are no other towers with reasonable properties. It would be much nicer, if one would be able to apply Proposition 3.8 to, say, $\mathscr{L}'_n := L(\mu_{p^n})_S^{\mathrm{tm}}$: then the last part of (C4) gets obsolete. Unfortunately, we are not able to obtain full control over $\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}'_n/L)$, as wild ramification is in the game (although this wild ramification 'just' comes from the cyclotomic $\mathbb{Z}_p$-tower).

Proof of Theorem 1.3. For each $K_{1,S_1}/L_1/K_1$, let L_2 be the field corresponding to L_1 via σ. By assumption (1) in Theorem 1.3 we have a local correspondence at the boundary, i.e., there is a G_{K_1,S_1}-invariant map

$$\sigma_*\colon S_{1,f}(K_{1,S_1}) \xrightarrow{\sim} S_{2,f}(K_{2,S_2}),$$

characterized by $\sigma(D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}) = D_{\sigma_*(\bar{\mathfrak{p}})}$, which induces bijections σ_{*,L_1} at each finite level $K_{1,S_1}/L_1/K_1$. Moreover, the decomposition subgroups of primes in S_i are full local groups, hence σ_{*,L_1} preserves residue characteristics, the absolute degrees of primes, the inertia degrees and the ramification indices.

Further, if $I_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ denote the inertia and $R_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$ the wild inertia subgroup of $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}$, then $\sigma(I_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}) = I_{\sigma_*(\bar{\mathfrak{p}})}$ and $\sigma(R_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}}) = R_{\sigma_*(\bar{\mathfrak{p}})}$. In particular, if L_1, L_2 correspond via σ, then also L_{1,S_1}^{tm}, L_{2,S_2}^{tm} do, and we have $g_{M_1/L_1} = g_{M_2/L_2}$ if M_1/L_1 is tame. Moreover, this implies, that if $K_{1,S_1}/\mathscr{L}_1/L_1/K_1$ is a tamely ramified subextension, then

$$\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_1/L_1) = \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(\mathscr{L}_2/L_2). \tag{5.1}$$

Due to Lemma 4.1 it is enough to show the existence of σ_* after a finite extension of K inside K_S. Thus by [Iv14] Theorem 1.1, we can assume that $\mu_p \subseteq K$. Moreover, by condition (C4), we can assume that for any finite subextension $K_S/M/K$ and any $\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_M^f$, the extension $M_S^{\{\mathfrak{p}\},\mathrm{tm}}/M$ is infinite, there is no $M_S^{\mathrm{tm},\{\mathfrak{p}\}}/L/M$ finite, such that $M_S^{\{\mathfrak{p}\},\mathrm{tm}}/L$ is unramified and that $\bigcup_{K_S^H/L/K} L_S^{\mathrm{tm}}$ has no prime of finite norm for any H as in (C4).

Due to Corollary 4.9, to show the existence of σ_*, it is enough to show that for any pro-cyclic subgroup $Z_1 \subseteq \mathrm{G}_{K_1,S_1}$ with infinite pro-p-Sylow subgroup, the following holds: if Z_1 has (C2)- (resp. (C3)-) decomposition behavior, then $Z_2 := \sigma(Z_1)$ also has. Due to (C4), we can restrict attention only to such subgroups Z_1, for which $K_{1,S_1}^{\langle\langle Z_1\rangle\rangle_{\mathrm{G}_{K_1,S_1}},\mathrm{tm}}/K_1$ is infinitely ramified (and hence, in particular, infinite). Note that then the same is true for Z_2 instead of Z_1. By definition of decomposition behavior, it is enough to show that for all $K_{1,S_1}^{Z_1}/L_1/K_1$ finite, one has

$$\beta(L_{1,S_1}^{Z_{1,L_1}}/L_1) = \beta(L_{2,S_2}^{Z_{2,L_2}}/L_2),$$

where Z_{i,L_i} is the normal subgroup of G_{L_1,S_1} generated by Z_i. By the last statement of Proposition 3.8 (applied to $L := M_i$ and $\mathscr{L}_\infty := \mathscr{L}_n := M_{i,S_i}^{\mathrm{tm}}$), we know that (we omit the index $i = 1, 2$):

$$\beta(L_S^{Z_L}/L) = \lim_{L_S^{Z_L}/M/L} \frac{1}{[M:L]}(\beta(M_S^{\mathrm{tm}} \cap L^{Z_L}/M) - \beta(M_S^{\mathrm{tm}}/M)) \tag{5.2}$$

Note that the assumptions of Proposition 3.8 are satisfied. Indeed,

(i) we know that $K_S^{Z_K} \cap K_S^{\mathrm{tm}}/K$ is infinitely ramified, and $L_S^{Z_L} \cap M_S^{\mathrm{tm}} \supseteq K_S^{Z_K} \cap K_S^{\mathrm{tm}}$. Hence also $M_S^{\mathrm{tm}} \cap L^{Z_L}/M$ is infinite and ramified, i.e., $\mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(M_S^{\mathrm{tm}}/M) \leq \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(M_S^{\mathrm{tm}} \cap L^{Z_L}/M) < \infty$,
(ii) on the other side $0 < \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(M_S^{\mathrm{tm}}/M) \leq \mu_{\mathrm{rel}}(M_S^{\mathrm{tm}} \cap L^{Z_L}/M)$ by Lemma 3.2.
(iii) $\bigcup_{L_S^{Z_L}/M/L} M_S^{\mathrm{tm}} \supseteq \bigcup_{K_S^{Z_K}/M/K} M_S^{\mathrm{tm}}$ has no prime of finite norm by (C4).

Finally, by the first statement of Proposition 3.8, the right side of (5.2) can be expressed in terms of λ_{rel} and μ_{rel} of the tamely ramified towers $M_S^{\mathrm{tm}} \cap L^{Z_L}/M$ and M_S^{tm}/M. Hence the right sides of (5.2) coincide for $i = 1, 2$. Thus Z_1 has decomposition behavior if and only if Z_2 has and we are done. This all shows the existence of the compatible bijections σ_{*,L_1}. Moreover, it is clear from Theorem 4.8 and preceeding computations, that the maps σ_{*,L_1} preserve norms of primes. □

6. The p-adic volume of the unit lattice

The results of this section are independent from the rest of the article. Let p be an odd prime, K a number field, $S \supseteq S_\infty \cup S_p$ a finite set of primes of K. In contrast to the usual regulator, it is possible to reconstruct the p-adic volume $\mathrm{vol}_p(K)$ of the unit lattice of K from the fundamental group $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ (+ some more information). For a definition of $\mathrm{vol}_p(K)$ we refer to [NSW08] 10.3.3.

Proposition 6.1. *Let K be a number field, $S \supseteq S_\infty$ a finite set of primes of K, such that at least two rational primes lie in $\mathcal{O}^*_{K,S}$ and let p be one of them. Assume $p > 2$ or K totally imaginary. Assume the Leopoldt conjecture holds for K and p. Then*

$$(\mathrm{G}_{K,S}, p, \chi_p) \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{vol}_p(K).$$

Proof. By [Iv14] Theorem 1.1, the given information is enough to reconstruct the position of decomposition subgroups of primes in S^f inside $\mathrm{G}_{K,S}$ and hence also in its pro-p-quotient $\mathrm{G}^{(p)}_{K,S}$. For a prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in (S^f \smallsetminus S_p)(K_S^{(p)})$, we have a map with open image $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},K_S^{(p)}/K} \to \mathbb{Z}_p$, which is induced by the cyclotomic character $\chi_p'\colon \mathrm{G}^{(p)}_{K,S} \to \mathbb{Z}_p$. The inertia subgroups $I_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},K_S^{(p)}/K} \subseteq D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},K_S^{(p)}/K}$ are the kernels of this map. Therefore we can reconstruct the quotient $\mathrm{G}^{(p)}_{K,S_p}$ of $\mathrm{G}^{(p)}_{K,S}$ together with the decomposition subgroups at S_p by dividing out the normal subgroup generated by $I_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},K_S^{(p)}/K}$ for $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \in S^f \smallsetminus S_p$. Hence we can also reconstruct the following exact sequence from class field theory (cf. [NSW08] 8.3.21):

$$0 \to \overline{\mathcal{O}^*_{K,S_p}} \to \prod_{\mathfrak{p}\in S_p} K_{\mathfrak{p}}^{*,(p)} \to \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{ab},(p)}_{K,S_p} \to \mathrm{Cl}_{\mathrm{S_p}}(\mathrm{K})^{(\mathrm{p})} \to 0$$

where the upper index (p) denotes the pro-p completion and $\overline{\mathcal{O}^*_{K,S_p}}$ denotes the closure of the image of $\mathcal{O}^*_{K,S_p}$ in $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}\in S_p} K_{\mathfrak{p}}^{*,(p)}$. Note that the decomposition groups $D_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},K_S/K}$ are the full local groups by [CC09] and hence by class fields theory $K_{\mathfrak{p}}^{*,(p)} \cong \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{ab},(p)}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}} \cong D^{\mathrm{ab},(p)}_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}},K_S/K}$. Let $U_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset K^*_{\mathfrak{p}}$ be the units of $\mathcal{O}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}}$. The Leopoldt conjecture and [NSW08] 10.3.13 with $S = S_p \cup S_\infty$, $T = \emptyset$ shows the exactness of the rows of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{\mathcal{O}^*_K} & \longrightarrow & \prod_{\mathfrak{p}\in S_p} U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(p)} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{ab},(p)}_{K,S_p} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Cl}^{(\mathrm{p})}_{\mathrm{K}} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \| & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{\mathcal{O}^*_{K,S_p}} & \hookrightarrow & \prod_{\mathfrak{p}\in S_p} K_{\mathfrak{p}}^{*,(p)} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{ab},(p)}_{K,S_p} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Cl}^{(\mathrm{p})}_{\mathrm{K,S_p}} \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{O}^*_K}$ is the closure of the image of $\mathcal{O}^*_K$ inside $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}\in S_p} U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(p)}$. We can reconstruct the second vertical map from the given data ($U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(p)}$ correspond to the inertia subgroup via the reciprocity isomorphism $K_{\mathfrak{p}}^{*,(p)} \to \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{ab},(p)}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}}$). An easy diagram chase shows $\overline{\mathcal{O}^*_K} = \overline{\mathcal{O}^*_{K,S_p}} \cap \prod_{\mathfrak{p}\in S_p} U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(p)}$. Hence we can reconstruct the upper left horizontal map in the above diagram. Apply $-\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Q}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p$ to it; now the proposition follows from [NSW08] 10.3.8 as $r_1(K), r_2(K)$ can be reconstructed from the given data and as the natural map $\mathcal{O}^*_K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p \twoheadrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{O}^*_K}$ is an isomorphism by Leopoldt's conjecture. □

Acknowledgments. First of all I want to mention, that the idea to search for a group theoretic criterion for small norm of primes in number fields was given to me originally by Jakob Stix during writing of my Ph.D. thesis. I want to thank Jakob Stix, Florian Pop, Jochen Gärtner and Johannes Schmidt for fruitful discussions on this subject, from which I learned a lot. Last but not least, I want to thank Malte Witte for helping me with some questions concerning Iwasawa theory. The author wants to thank the Technical Univeristy Munich, where this work was done.

References

[CC09] Chenevier G., Clozel L.: *Corps de nombres peu ramifiés et formes automorphes autoduales*, J. of the AMS, vol. **22**, no. 2, 2009, p. 467-519.

[Ch07] Chenervier G.: *On number fields with given ramification*, Comp. Math. **143** (2007), no. 6, 1359-1373.

[Gre02] Greenberg R.: *Iwasawa theory – past and present* Adv. Stud. Pure Math. 30, Tokyo: Math. Soc. Japan, pp. 335âĂŞ385

[Gro83] Grothendieck A.: *A letter to Faltings*, 1983.

[Ne69] Neukirch J.: *Kennzeichnung der p-adischen und der endlich algebraischen Zahlkörper*, Invent. Math. **6** (1969) 296-314.

[NSW08] Neukirch J., Schmidt A., Wingberg K.: *Cohomology of number fields*, Springer, 2008, second edition.

[Iv14] Ivanov A.: *On some anabelian properties of arithmetic curves*, 2014, Manuscripta Math. **144**, 545-564.

[HM01] Hajir F., Maire C.: *Tamely ramified towers and discriminant bounds for number fields*, Compositio Math., **128** (2001), pp. 35-53.

[LN00] Lannuzel A., Nguyen Quang Do T.: *Conjectures de Greenberg et extensions pro-p-libres d'un corps de nombres*, Manuscripta math. **102**, 187-209 (2000).

[McCal01] McCallum W.G.: *Greenberg's conjecture and units in multiple $\mathbb{Z}_p$-extensions*, Amer. J. Math. **123**, No. 5, (2001), 909-930.

[Ng83] Nguyen-Quang-Do T.: *Formations de classes et modules d'Iwasawa*, Number theory Noordwijkerhout, 1983, LNM **1068**, Springer, Berlin, pp. 167-185.

[Sch07] Schmidt A.: *Rings of integers of type $K(\pi, 1)$*, 2007, Doc. Math. **12** (2007), 441-471.

[Sch10] Schmidt A.: *Über Pro-p-Fundamentalgruppen markierter arithmetischer Kurven*, J. reine u. angew. Math. **640** (2010) 203-235.

[Se79] Serre J.-P., *Local Fields*, Springer, 1979.

[Ta97] Tamagawa A.: *The Grothendieck conjecture for affine curves*, Comp. Math. **109** (1997), 135-194.

[TV02] Tsfasman M, Vlăduţ S.: *Infinite global fields and the generalized Brauer-Siegel theorem*, Moscow Math. J., 2002, vol.2, pp. 329-402, 2002.

[Wa82] Washington L.: *Zeros of p-adic L-functions*, Séminaire de théorie de nombres, Paris, 1980-81 (Sem. Delange-Pisot-Poitou), Birkhäuser, Boston, 1982, pp. 337-357.

[Zy05] Zykin A.: *Brauer-Siegel and Tsfasman-Vlăduţ theorems for almost normal extensions of global fields*, Moscow Mathematical Journal, Vol. 5 (2005), Num. 4, 961-968.

E-mail address: ivanov@ma.tum.de

Zentrum Mathematik - M11, Technische Universität München, Boltzmannstr. 3, 85748 Garching bei München, Germany